

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on June 27, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 21, and 27-32 are amended, claim 23 is canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-6, 15-17, 20-21, and 24-32 are now pending in this application.

**§103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 21, and 26-32 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oda (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,888) in view of Malik (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,832). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Applicant does not admit that the Malik reference is indeed prior art that covers claims as currently presented, however, in the interest of furthering prosecution of the present application, Applicant has combined claim 21 with claim 23. Applicant's independent claim 21, as amended, recites, "in the form of an ASIC that is removable to accept and utilize a substitute ASIC". The quoted language was taken from dependent claim 23, which the Examiner has indicated contains allowable subject matter.

Similarly, independent claims 1 and 27-32 each are amended to include, "in the form of an ASIC that is removable to accept and utilize a substitute ASIC".

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element and limitation of independent claims 1, 21, and 27-32 is not described, taught or suggested in the Oda and Malik references, either individually or in combination, and that claims 1, 21, and 27-32 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of claims 1, 21, and 27-32, as well as those claims that depend therefrom.

Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oda (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,888) in view of Malik (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,832) and further in view of Inose, et al. (6,068,359). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

For the reasons provided above regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicant submits that independent claim 1, from which claims 3 and 4 depend, is in condition for allowance. From Applicant's review of the Inose reference, it does not cure the deficiencies of the Oda and Malik references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of the above dependent claims.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 15-17, and 20.

Claims 23-25 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant believes claim 21, as amended, is in condition for allowance, at least in part because it includes allowable subject matter from claim 23. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 24-25 are also in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Gregg W. Wisdom at (360) 212-8052 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 21<sup>st</sup> day of September, 2005.

Name

Sarah L. Reinhard

Signature

Sarah L. Reinhard

Respectfully Submitted,  
Juan Carles Vives, et al.

By their Representatives,  
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500  
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By:

Edward J. Brooks III  
Edward J. Brooks III  
Reg. No. 40,925

Date:

9/21/2005